Liberty

NOT THE DAUGHTER BUT THE MOTHER OF ORDER. — PROUDHON

Vol. XII.—No. 11. NEW YORK, N. Y., JANUARY, 1897. Whole No. 349.

"*For always in thine eyes, O Liberty!*
Shines that high light whereby the world is saved;
And though thou slay us, we will trust in thee."
John Hay.

On Picket Duty.

Through some misunderstanding Mr. Byington's Letter-Writing Corps targets for the monthly slip to be sent to corps members between the monthly issues of Liberty did not reach me, and so no slips were sent out. Members are cautioned against interpreting this as an abandonment of the fortnightly assignment of targets.

One of the Single Tax organs is making much of a claim that Ella Wheeler Wilcox is a believer in the Single Tax. Does it not know that Ella Wheeler Wilcox believes in everything that comes along? No fleeting fad, no passing folly, is too silly to command her adhesion. But lately she was mad over Cheiro, the palmist. Now it is Henry George that this poetess of passion adores.

My statement that Canovas del Castillo had asked for a catalogue of my publications was an error, for which the messenger that came to my office from the Spanish consulate is responsible. He said that the request came from the Spanish premier. I now learn that it came from a Spanish ex-premier, Segismundo Moret y Prendergast,—quite as notable a man as Canovas, but belonging to the Liberal party, and of course not now a member of the government.

Comrade Fulton's "Age of Thought" carries the good work valiantly on, and I wish to bespeak for him once more the coöperation of all libertarians. From the craftsman's point of view his paper is scarcely well edited, but there is thought in its pages, and the right spirit. It doubtless will cast off much of its crudity and disorder as its editor's difficulties diminish, and even now this brave little weekly is a mighty good dollar's worth. Send a dollar for a year's subscription to E. H. Fulton, Columbus Junction, Iowa.

It is dangerous to publish cheap literature. Your motives are liable to misconstruction. For instance, an angry Single Taxer told a friend of mine the other day that, in publishing and selling my pamphlet attack on Henry George at the low rate of eighty cents per hundred copies, I thereby demonstrated beyond peradventure that I did so to satisfy some feeling of personal animosity. As a matter of fact there never have been any personal relations between George and myself that could possibly develop any personal feeling. I made his acquaintance many years ago, when he called on me in Boston. We had a few moments of brief and hurried, but entirely agreeable, conversation, and since that day we have never communicated either by spoken or written word. Never have I had the smallest private grievance against this man, whom I despise solely because of his palpable public dishonesty, manifested in more ways than one.

It is either remembered or forgotten that some time ago I notified all readers of Liberty who had sent me money with orders for books that, if dissatisfied with my necessary delay in filling these orders, their money would be sent back to them on demand and by return mail. Since the appearance of that notice I have had about four demands for such return of money, and in each instance the demand has been complied with promptly. Such an offer ought to set at rest all suspicion that I am either dishonest or wilfully neglectful in this matter. Nevertheless it has come to my knowledge that even old and tried friends of Liberty are writing letters in which these motives, if not directly charged, are at least hinted at. It seems to me that they might be in better business.

At first thought it may seem to some of my readers that to give my approval to the article of Arsène Alexandre on "The Lady of the Beaux-Arts" is inconsistent with the position, taken by me in a previous issue, that it is better to encourage art than to build hospitals. But such is not the case. The thing that M. Alexandre condemns is a mistaken method of encouraging art. It is an encouragement that does not encourage. To afford individual art students the means of stifling their originality in routine is one thing. To permeate the artistic atmosphere with ideas tending to strike down routine and indirectly develop originality wherever it may appear is quite another thing. The latter is the real encouragement of art. With M. Alexandre's position I am in full sympathy, except that I think that there has been an occasional exception to his sweeping rule that genius is never stifled by poverty.

The newspapers are making much of the fact that William Morris left none of his fortune of $275,000 to the cause of Socialism, but bequeathed it all to his family, like any ordinary *bourgeois*. But has it ever occurred to these smart editors that William Morris left behind him, not only a fortune, but also a Socialistic family, and that possibly he had an understanding with his heirs, or had confidence without such understanding, that a due proportion of their inheritance should be devoted to the ends to which he and they were alike devoted? What better trustees for a Socialistic fund could William Morris have asked than his daughter May and her husband, Halliday Sparling,—both ardent Socialistic workers? I do not speak by the card, but I think it is too early to positively assert, or even hint, that Morris forgot in dying that which he stood for, living.

Secretary Morton is not as great a humbug as the typical secretary of agriculture usually is, but his ardent professions of democracy have little value, in view of his obvious ignorance of what democracy is. Of course he is for sound money, honor, civilization, gravitation, and everything else that is dear to a gold-bug, but he is clearly not for democracy. "Nearly always when they have an opportunity," he says dolefully, "the people vote for schemes and devices to destroy public credit and bring financial dishonor." This means that popular government is a farce and sham, and that Mr. Morton is not a believer in democratic institutions. He is right in asserting the ignorance of the people, but wrong in imagining that they would do better to follow the experts who prate about honor and credit. *Their* schemes and devices mean nothing but spoliation, rascality, and robbery. Let Mr. Morton read what Dana has to say about usury and the present financial system.

In his farewell message to the Illinois legislature Governor Altgeld suggested, as a partial solution of the difficult problem that the growing practice of libel presents, that no action, either criminal or civil, should lie against the authors or publishers of signed articles, but that heavy penalties should be imposed on publishers of libellous articles bearing no signature. It is a practical suggestion from an eminently practical man. A libel has little or no influence when signed by an irresponsible or disreputable person, and may therefore be disregarded. On the other hand, statements made over the signature of a person of high character are never malicious and very rarely false. It is the anonymous attack that is to be dreaded and deplored. The thing chiefly desirable, argues Governor Altgeld, is the prevention of unsigned libels, and his suggestion, if acted upon, would probably be effective to that end. Of course, it would not settle the question whether libel is non-invasive and therefore to be let alone, but it would allow greater liberty of the press than now prevails, while at the same time insuring a greater decency of the press.

Liberty.

Issued Monthly at Sixty Cents a Year; Two Years, One Dollar; Single Copies, Five Cents.

BENJ. R. TUCKER, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

Office of Publication, 24 Gold Street.
Post Office Address: LIBERTY, P. O. Box No. 1312, New York, N. Y.

Entered at New York as Second-Class Mail Matter.

NEW YORK, N. Y., JANUARY, 1897.

"In abolishing rent and interest, the last vestiges of old-time slavery, the Revolution abolishes at one stroke the sword of the executioner, the seal of the magistrate, the club of the policeman, the gauge of the exciseman, the erasing-knife of the department clerk, all those insignia of Politics, which young Liberty grinds beneath her heel." — PROUDHON.

☞ The appearance in the editorial column of articles over other signatures than the editor's initial indicates that the editor approves their central purpose and general tenor, though he does not hold himself responsible for every phrase or word. But the appearance in other parts of the paper of articles by the same or other writers by no means indicates that he disapproves them in any respect, such disposition of them being governed largely by motives of convenience.

The Feather That Felled Me.

Probably most public speakers, especially those who, like myself, speak but occasionally and are never so ill at ease as when on their feet before an audience, have at some time passed through the unpleasant experience of being thrown into utter confusion when called upon to answer a question of so simple a character as to surprise one out of his wits. Such was my sorry plight one evening two or three weeks ago, at a meeting of the Sunrise Club; and I shall tell the painful story now, partly as a sort of penance for my own stupidity, partly in the hope that it will be read by some members of the club who supposed me to have been the victim of a keen and searching questioner rather than of my absence of mind, and partly as a bit of economic elucidation that may prevent others from being puzzled as I was.

The Sunrise Club, then, be it known, is a New York dining club of about one hundred members, of all shades of opinion, who dine together, on the "Dutch treat" plan, every second Monday evening throughout the winter season, and then spend an hour or two in discussion, the opener thereof and the subject being selected in advance. At the particular dinner now in question the opener was Mr. Ernest H. Crosby, who had chosen as his topic, "The Issue of Honesty in the Late Campaign." I shall report here only so much of his brief discourse as relates to the point of my subsequent criticism. After declaring his intellectual conviction that the Republicans had the right side of the money question in the campaign, he admitted that his sympathies had been with their opponents; and, inquiring what could be the cause of this strange discrepancy between his thought and his feeling, he concluded that the campaign must have involved a question of deeper honesty than the mere honesty or dishonesty of the currency. The claim of the holder of money upon the labor or service of others is, he said,—or seemed to say, at any rate; I cannot give his exact words,—inferior, in point of honesty, to the obligation of every man to work for his living; and he found the cause of his sympathies with Mr. Bryan and his followers in the campaign in the fact that they represented the men who work for their living as against the men who buy their living with money. Then, to make plain the inferiority of the merely monetary obligation, he supposed the case of a shipwrecked party cast upon a desert island, some of the party being millionaires, some being moderately well-to-do professional men, and some being penniless laborers. There being no means of shelter, and shelter being a necessity to all, it would become necessary to build a shelter, in which case, Mr. Crosby claimed, it manifestly would be less honest for one of the millionaires to take a ten-dollar bill from his pocket and hire one of the laborers to do, in addition to his own share of the work of building, the share of the millionaire also, than to take off his coat and engage with the laborers in the task at hand.

Toward the close of the discussion that followed the opener's address, I was called on for a few remarks, and, responding, I directed my criticism at the position outlined above. Putting aside all question of the manner in which the cast-away millionaires originally got their money, and assuming that their money represented actually what paper money always represents in theory,—service previously performed and as yet unpaid for except by paper title,—I took the ground that the millionaire who should pay a ten-dollar bill to a laborer to put a roof over his head would be quite as honest in his conduct as though, instead, he should build his house himself. I held that the presence of a ten-dollar bill in the millionaire's pocket was evidence (assuming it to have been obtained under free conditions, and by neither dishonesty or tyranny) that he had already done his part toward the building of the shelter by rendering an equivalent service previously, and that to insist that he should do his part again—that is, bear a double burden—in order that the laborers might escape with the performance of less than their proportionate share of work would be dishonest in the extreme. The inferiority of one obligation to the other I denied, maintaining that the obligation of the individual to work for his living can never exceed the always exactly equivalent obligation to furnish him his living which falls upon those for whom he has worked.

At this point the opener asked permission to put a question,—a request which I indiscreetly granted. "Will you tell us," then asked Mr. Crosby, "what would happen on the desert island if each member of the shipwrecked party were the possessor of a ten-dollar bill?" Now, incredible as it may seem, this question, which the merest tyro in economics should be able to answer without a moment's thought, floored me completely. The words had hardly fallen from Mr. Crosby's lips before the audience laughed as though a triumphant point had been scored against the terrible Tucker, and I am bound to confess that the sheepish attitude of the aforesaid terror went far to justify their glee. After a moment's embarrassment, I managed to stammer out that in that case it would be necessary for all the shipwrecked persons to go to work together, each doing his share toward the building of the shelter; which answer, of course, was true, but unfortunately, on its face, seemed to bear out Mr. Crosby in his original contention rather than sustain my criticism thereof. Then Mr. Starr Hoyt Nichols suggested that in the case supposed those who had the least money would work for those who had the most,—a suggestion which I, regardless of the fact that it involved an assumption violently at odds with the case supposed,—that hypothetical case being now one of equality in monetary wealth,—frantically clutched at as a drowning man clutches at a straw. Then Mr. John H. Edelman, a Communist, perceiving, I presume, that my situation was becoming more and more hopeless, inquired why it would not be advisable to come down to a natural basis and assume that all men would desire to work in the presence of such conditions,—a truth which I should have characterized as irrelevant had I not been "rattled," but to which, as it was, I extended a not too reluctant hand. Nobody else coming to my rescue, I rambled about aimlessly for a few seconds more, and then subsided. The chairman, noticing the abruptness with which I had first lost the thread of my argument and then cut it off, asked me if I had quite finished, thereby supplying the one thing needful to complete my discomfiture. Yet, to tell the truth, I consider that the chairman was much too lenient. Had he, in the exercise of his brief authority, ordered Mr. Crosby and myself to turn our faces to the wall and so remain until the hour of adjournment, Mr. Crosby for having asked so simple a question and myself for having been even temporarily unable to answer it, we should have had only our deserts.

I am unable to account for the connection between the seat of a chair and the mental condition of a man whose brains are properly located, but certain it is that I had scarcely taken my seat when my scattered wits began to gather; so that presently I saw clearly that Mr. Crosby had unwittingly given me a rare opportunity to clinch my criticism of his position, and that I had stupidly wasted it. Of course, in answer to his question, I had only to point out that the reason why the shipwrecked men, if equally rich in money, would all go to work is to be found in the fact that their respective ten-dollar bills cancel each other and therefore become as nought, in order to confirm my criticism and overthrow Mr. Crosby's position; for bills cannot cancel each other, unless each bill is a thing that can be canceled, and where there is no obligation there is nothing that can be canceled. *Ergo*, a paper promise to pay is an obligation,—an obligation to pay for labor or service rendered, and, as such, not inferior or superior, but exactly equal, to the counter obligation to perform labor or service,—which is the proposition that Mr. Crosby attempted to disprove.

One of the purposes of this confession of mine will have been fully accomplished if by it any doubting reader shall be convinced that "the issue of honesty in the late campaign" was not between those, on the one hand, who work for their living and those, on the other, who buy their living with money, but between those, on the one hand, who buy their living with money that they *earn* and those, on the other, who buy their living with money that they *steal*.

T.

Cowards in the Jury-Box.

At a recent murder trial held in the United States court at Boston, the jury being seemingly unable to reach an agreement, Judge Colt charged them that, while each juror's verdict should be his own and not another's, yet each of the minority jurors should consider whether the doubt that seemed to him reasonable could in reality be reasonable if it did not so seem to the majority of the jury. This is the essence of the judge's charge on the point in question, his actual words constituting a paragraph of considerable length so artfully constructed and contrived as to subordinate almost to the point of obliteration the assertion of the individual juror's sovereignty, and convey an impression that the minority should accept the verdict of the majority simply because it was the verdict of the majority. Still, buried as it was, the saving clause was there, and it is hardly imaginable that any juror, holding the fate of a human being in his hands, could have exercised so little care as to fail to search for and find it.

Nevertheless the jury soon rendered a verdict of guilty, the former vote having been seven for conviction to five for acquittal; and now comes Juror Harry T. Booth (I give his name to preserve his infamy), and declares that he and four other jurymen voted guilty against their convictions because they understood the court to have "practically instructed the jury that the minority must give in to the majority." How careless and ignorant must be the men whom a judge, however artful, could thus befuddle, and what knaves and slaves they must be, too, to be willing to obey the judge who, in their view, was committing an act of usurpation! Between the insidious encroachments of judges and the cringing servility of jurors, that sole remaining safeguard of personal liberty, the unanimous verdict of a jury, is in serious danger of being wiped out. T.

The Lady of the Beaux-Arts.*

"A lady who desires to remain unknown has placed at the disposition of the Beaux-Arts school a villa at Neuilly containing three living-apartments and three studios for artists. This villa, admirably situated and overlooking the valley of the Seine, is placed, by the donor, at the disposition of three of the poorest and at the same time most meritorious pupils of the school."

Such is the information given by "Le Figaro" and reproduced by all the newspapers with comments, as a rule, emotional. As this good lady insists on preserving the strictest anonymity (at least for such time as is required for the penetration of secrets like this), one may conclude that the motive of her conduct is not a desire to be deafened by the sounding of her praises, and this enables one to address her frankly without embarrassment.

The lady of the Beaux-Arts is the victim of a delusion. Her misguided anxiety has fallen upon persons of whom one may safely say, though not knowing them, that they will become absolutely uninteresting from the moment of their instalment at Neuilly. Had the villa been sold and converted into soup for old ragpickers or into little dresses for the babies that sprouted last night between the pavements of Belleville, it would have been but a mouthful and a bit of linen in the consumption of a city in which there are so many old and hungry ragpickers, and so many little two-footed mushrooms sown by one knows not who. Such a course would not have been very original; it would not have represented twenty-four hours of assistance; but it would have been better than to compromise the future of three able-bodied young persons in the way of whose success nothing stood.

These three young persons had everything in their favor: they were poor,— that is, obliged to earn their shelter; they were admitted to the Beaux-Arts school; and, finally, they were "meritorious,"— that is, had good marks, and were correct and docile young persons who had been taken under the protection of their masters and will go to Rome by the shortest of the innumerable roads that lead thither, the road of the Prix de Rome.

And now you abruptly put in their hands that for which are still struggling so many men already advanced in age and whose efforts, disappointments, and successes are past counting,— a rent-receipt.

You resemble those too generous godmothers who lavish on their godsons, at New Year's, expensive playthings which they are not yet capable of using,— a magnificent hunting-rifle, a precious Stradivarius, or a compound microscope. At the end of a fortnight the microscope is hopelessly out of order, though in the meantime the brat has discovered no new microbe, the old violin is in the condition of a four-cent fiddle, and the rifle has cost the gardener an eye.

So it probably will be with your three godsons, my lady of the Beaux-Arts. You will have given them too soon the plaything which even experienced men find the most difficult to handle and at the same time pursue their tasks,—the absence of fruitful anxiety. You extend your aid to false distresses, and it is a great pity that you have not been better informed. When one is a pupil in the Beaux-Arts school, one is somebody, one is many things, one is enormous. "Pupil in the Beaux-Arts school," —why! that can be put upon a visiting-card which, if one know how to use it, will open almost any door. One is already ticketed, classified, an aspirant for something. It is salvation in a country where one is looked at askance if he has not been at least once a candidate, and where, when one knows a thing, it is a great misfortune to have learned it all alone. These three young persons, however poor they may have been, were the larvæ of mandarins.

You do them a bad service in accustoming them to a shelter which they have neither paid for or really earned; you wrap their feet in wadding, and you fatten their livers. If the villa is granted to them for life, you make them privileged persons to the detriment of many others who have not perhaps their good marks, though having more merit. If you lodge them temporarily, then they will not learn how one pays his rent and how one does not pay it,—the two greatest stimulants to talent.

Again, there they are, stamped, celebrated, *quasi*-phenomenal, almost ridiculous. People will say of them: "These are the three poor young people of Neuilly." If, perchance, they pine away and do not yield the results that their masters expect of them, their failure will be the more remarked. If they achieve even a passable success, it will be "because of the lady."

Since you wished to find young people to protect efficaciously, perhaps you would have found them outside of these *quasi*-official surroundings, in spots where no official dreams of looking for them. You would have had to inform yourself, to scour the popular districts, to explore the primary schools, to make your way into holes and hovels, and to unearth among the crowds some rare and admirable head of a child. Of a child, I say, for a young man is too far advanced; a young man has no need, and should have no need, of aid. If he is incapable of executing without a springboard those perilous leaps which are necessary to one who wants to walk on his feet, he deserves no interest, still less that exceptional interest which it is your desire to manifest in the trio of Eliacins of the Rue Bonaparte.

And though you had found, far away from the Beaux-Arts school, the three white blackbirds in the act of breaking their wings and splitting their beaks, perhaps they would have refused your protection, at least in the form in which you offer it, had they been genuine, fast-color blackbirds. "If you find that I have talent," each would have said, "set me at work. Buy my painting, my sculpture, if you think it worth anything, and I will look out for my lodging."

My poor good lady, these are very disagreeable things that I am saying to you, and not in this fashion is it usual to extend thanks for charitable acts and intentions. It was your aim to do good, and you said to yourself that you would grow three magnificent plants in your little Neuilly hot-house. But for your cuttings you have gone to gardeners who know absolutely nothing, and who are capable of giving you Brussels sprouts for lilies and hips for roses. You have requested the professors of the Beaux-Arts school to pick out the three pupils whose future seems to warrant the deepest foundations, though there is no known instance of an official professor who could tell a gosling from an eaglet.

Furthermore, your classification is so artificial! The three poorest and at the same time the three most meritorious! But what if, at the particular moment, the three most meritorious are the three richest? And what if the three poorest are the three proudest? And what if they have a legitimate horror of favor? Ah! my poor good lady, you have rushed into a blind alley, and are in danger of having very ordinary tenants. Who knows even if they will take your good-will kindly? Is there a janitor in your villa? Will they be allowed to receive women there?

Your error lies in supposing that it is necessary to encourage youth.

The legends of youthful genius stifled by poverty are rigmaroles by which you, as a sentimental and respectful person, have suffered yourself to be caught. But there is no instance where genius, or even real talent simply, has not successfully buffeted winds and waves. Real human values are insubmergible. Undoubtedly at all ages there are storms, miseries,

* Translated from "Le Figaro" by the editor of Liberty.

anxieties, furies, despairs; but these are not inscribed upon the books of the department of charities, which is powerless against them.

They always point you to Malfilâtre, who is a little mouldy and, as a poet, rather ordinary, and, even at the Beaux-Arts school, to the sculptor Bryan, who did not die in poverty, as has been reported.

Console yourself; you are not the only one, my lady of the Beaux-Arts, who has thus misconceived the power of resistance and triumph that belongs to youth. It is the hobby of all the Mecenases (vain or sincere), of all administrations, of all will-makers. They concern themselves only with youth. They encourage it, they gorge it, they laurel it, they banner it, they medal it; they render it an infatuated and intolerable nuisance. By bringing into relief its promise, they sterilize it. We see about us nothing but young *protégés*, young masters, young bucks. But this is only the false youth, made up in reality of little old men. The only beautiful, the only true youth, the youth to which belongs the future, is that of which nobody thinks, which extricates itself from its own difficulties, and which official encouragements come neither to aid or corrupt.

Youth! a fine idea, indeed, to have thought of it, when everybody thinks of it! It is of old age that you should think, my lady of the Beaux-Arts. It is not to three young people of "promise" that you should lend your villa, but to three old miscarriages, three good old miscarriages, completely miscarried, who never promised anything, and so have never kept a promise. Only the miscarriages are interesting. They alone are entitled to all the solicitude, all the cajolery, all the compensation.

Believe me, good lady, there is still time; rededicate your house. Lend it, give it, to three old miscarriages whom we will surround with our respect and our sympathy. Perhaps later we shall find them in your three young persons.

Arsène Alexandre.

Macdonald, the Truth-Shunner.

With his usual inability, when unwilling, to understand the English language, George Macdonald, in replying to my article, "A Cry and a Lie," assumes that I base my charge of treachery against Henry George on the fact that he approved the decision of the supreme court against the Chicago Communists, and declares that, since George may have been sincere in such approval, the charge of treachery is not proved thereby. I have explained over and over again, and so clearly that every reader except Macdonald understands it, that I base my charge of treachery, not simply on George's approval of the court's decision, but also and *mainly* on George's deliberate, careful declaration, as a reason for such approval, of the absolute impossibility of error in a unanimous agreement of the supreme court. As it is inconceivable that a man of George's mental calibre should be a believer in the infallibility of judges, the fact that he declared such belief to bolster his cowardly attitude at a time when he was running for office can be explained only on the ground of insincerity and treachery. But Macdonald, in discussing the matter, will never attempt to meet this point, because his failure would demonstrate the correctness of my attitude, and, rather than admit that, he will be as dishonest as George himself. Upon the absolute lack of parallel between this proof of George's dishonesty and Macdonald's lame effort to convict me of treachery in the Venezuelan matter I do not conceive it necessary to insist further, despite the fact that Macdonald reiterates his ridiculous contention, while carefully refraining from letting his readers know the reason why I accused him of lying. Failing to make out a case for either George or himself, Macdonald next offers his anything but helping hand to the dying reputation of the dead Putnam. For him he pleads an *alibi*. Putnam, it seems, was not editorially at home when the letter of compliment to him in which it was proposed that all Anarchists be converted into corpses and exposed in that state to the public view was printed, prominently and *without protest*, in the *editorial* columns of his paper, "Freethought." The responsibility for that bit of infamy his wicked partner, Macdonald, tries to take solely upon himself. But again he makes a wretched failure. Putnam, whether at home or not at the time, returned shortly after, learned all about the matter, and, so far as I know, never in any way disowned the act, though, as chief or joint editor, he was either chiefly or jointly responsible. That responsibility cannot be thrown off his shoulders after his death. In declining to disown the dirty act he became to all intents and purposes the doer thereof, and his reputation must stand the consequences.

Macdonald professes to think that these consequences will not be serious, because my "brand" is getting burned out. Bearing upon this point, I may quote a recent conversation with a gentleman of the highest integrity, who is an intimate friend of Macdonald, was an intimate friend of Putnam, is a great admirer of Putnam, and is, withal, one of the best-known "plumb-line" Anarchists. Talking with him of Putnam since the latter's death, I reminded him of the facts in the matter of the "Freethought" letter, and asked him two direct questions. "Was Putnam's conduct in that matter decent?" "No," said he. "Was it honest?" "No," said he. And I am sure that the same honesty that compelled him to make these admissions, so damaging to his friend, will prevent him from acquitting him of guilt on the plea of an *alibi*. Now, if a man biassed by strong friendship found thus much virtue in my "brand," it may be found not entirely ineffective with persons who can view the matter impartially. At any rate, it appears that Macdonald is now smarting under it to such a degree that he appeals to some indefinite person to inflict physical vengeance upon me. At least, so I interpret his closing remark that somebody ought to accommodate me with justice, since I ask for justice. This remark is characteristic. It reminds me of those revolutionary editors who sit quietly in their offices and advise others to throw bombs. Macdonald, to all appearance, is an able-bodied man, weighing several hundred pounds and capable of doing his own fighting. Why does he seek a substitute?

T.

It is announced that County Clerk Henry D. Purroy, the bolting Tammany leader, purposes to run Henry George as his faction's candidate for the mayoralty of Greater New York. I counsel Mr. Purroy to look about him a bit before taking a step that will prove fatal to his political scheming. If Henry George is ever again a candidate for the New York mayoralty, it will not be my fault if a copy of "Henry George, Traitor," is not placed in the hands of every workingman in the city. There are laborers in this city even now who are endeavoring, by the distribution of this pamphlet, to make amends for their error in having voted for George in the past. Their number will be greatly multiplied if he ever makes a new bid for their votes.

The Value of Money and Its Volume.

To the Editor of Liberty:

Seeing that value depends upon volume, an inquiry into the causes and effects of the variation of the one is necessarily also a discussion of the circumstances pertaining to fluctuations of the other. If the quantity of gold available is small, its quality will be dearness; and, if the quantity of ashes be great, their quality will be cheapness. Conversely, it can rigorously be inferred that, if the quality of a commodity be cheapness or dearness, its quantity is great or small respectively. (1)

Exchange is a mutual transfer of two commodities between two parties. The media of the exchange are the two commodities.(2) One is not the medium of the exchange of the other any more than the second is of the first. If one's tailor hands over a coat upon credit for two guineas, then the coat buys the right to be paid, just as much as the duty to pay buys the coat. One wants the coat; the tailor wants the right to payment more than he wants the coat. Hence the exchange. Each obtains something which is to him more useful (consequently more valuable) than what he alienates from his own possession.

But, it may be answered, "one wants the coat to wear—to consume; while the tailor wants the right, in order that he may shortly obtain the guineas, and he wants the guineas, not to consume, but merely to sell for things which he will consume. such as bread, shoes, coal, or cloth, as the case may be. Hence, it will further be urged, the debt is here the medium of exchange, the guineas are the standard of value, and "one can but wonder at Mr. Fisher's lack of power to conceive of media of exchange and standards of value . . . . as two distinct classes of things."(3) The idea seems to be that consumable things are not media of exchange, and that media of exchange are not consumable things. This may not be expressly admitted, but it seems to be tacitly involved in the arguments of Mr. Badcock and others as to the scarcity of the medium of exchange. It is absolutely unquestionable that "there is only one money, and that is gold. The price of gold is gold. Gold and money are not merely at par. They are identical and homogeneous." Fractional coins, tokens, promises, are not money.(4) They may—that is, some of them may—be at par with the money they name. This parity is always dependent upon habitual, constant, and invariable convertibility; in fact, upon a popular belief that no interruption or delay in convertibility need be taken into account.(5)

Money is, then, a consumable commodity (namely, gold), and debts, tokens, etc., are liabilities to tender gold on demand or upon a named date. The debt is a representative of a specified value; the gold has the value (utility) in itself. No one supposes that the tailor wants to consume the two guineas which he one day is to obtain in redemption of the debt for which the coat was exchanged. He desires to exchange it again. This is why it is regarded as being to him merely a medium of exchange. But among the things he will buy are cloth and trimmings to make garments *which he will not consume*. These he uses in their turn as media of exchange to buy more gold. When he buys cloth, he values cloth more than the gold he sells for it. When he sells raiment, he values more the gold it buys.

Mr. Badcock's recent essay on "The Money Famine" has been criticised on the ground that he has confused money with wealth. But the fact is that

money is wealth and never anything else. All wealth is not money, but all money is gold, and gold is wealth. At the same time all gold is not actual coin. There can, therefore, be no money famine. If a man had made all his flour into cakes, and there were some show of reason for the idea that there were not enough cakes to go round, then he might be judged to be face to face with the wolf at the door. But, so long as he has a great store of flour and the demand for cakes does not press him to convert all his flour into cakes, then the allegation of famine is palpably absurd. Man can bake his gold into sovereign cakes free of all cost. Free mints convert all gold mines into money farms.

The benefit of checks and other forms of money notes arises not so much from their increasing the volume of money as from their reducing (to the vanishing-point in large transactions) the ponderosity of real money. They add to the portability of money, without interfering with its divisibility.(6)

If Mr. Badcock concedes (7) that very wide variations in the value of gold would produce no great permanent injury or benefit, then a step in this controversy has undoubtedly been made. When he argues that the question of value is not identical with the question of volume, he does not appear to hold that the comparative indifference to its monetary function from great changes in the value of gold is in itself fallacious. He "will not trouble to controvert the assertion." Can it be assumed that he assents to it? (8)

Mr. Badcock's prominence in discussion upon monetary restraints is sufficiently great to make it worth while to be able to agree with him upon this point, as well as upon the point that the evils of restraint far outweigh its advantages.

The Bank of England is liable to pay on demand its own promissory notes ("Bank notes," U. K. dialect; "Bank bills," U. S. A. dialect). It is also liable to pay on demand every check which may be issued by customers against their balances in current account. This latter liability is not restricted by the Bank charter act. Hence the Bank actually issues a form of monetary paper, not "*against*" a metal reserve, but far in excess of that which is so equipoised. There is, however, seldom a demand for such a volume of money as will bring into circulation any large proportion of this available monetary substitute. This is a further proof that money is abundant, and not scarce. The available issue is never required.(9)

Mr. Badcock complains that possible operations ought not to "prevent our issuing certificates of value upon all [our] property." Neither he or any one else has shown what form of document he proposes should be drawn.(10) Is an owner of cotton, or iron, to undertake to deliver cotton or iron, or is each to promise ultimately gold, and, if so, under what qualifications?

It may be predicted that, while convertible paper is at par, delayed paper will always be subject to a discount.(11) There are markets where unlimited quantities of cotton and other things can be bought and sold for future delivery. These contracts constitute a more or less negotiable scrip. They are not monetized; that is to say, they are not aurified. They represent, rather, cases in which gold is cottonized or ironized, as the case may be; that is to say, so much gold is here desirably demonetized, and its place taken by a cotton or other note.

The time has come for an explanation of what these free-money people really want. Is it one-pound notes? Are they to be convertible by issuer on demand? In such a proposal they surely can reckon on the support of all lovers of liberty. But one-pound notes would not do much good. They might, and probably would, do some. In any case they would, under liberty, be issued unrestrictedly, and in many cases without reference to any mass of metal or other wealth against which they were supposed to be issued. The scheme of the Mutual Bankists is that some agreement between the shareholders of the mutual bank would provide for the continual circulation of the notes primarily among these members, and, secondly, among the public at large. The nature and extent of the liability of these members to sell commodities for these notes has never been formulated. (13) It is like all the other proposals,—left vague. It is never shown how a retailer, merchant, or manufacturer could use these notes in his business, to any material advantage. A power to issue one's own checks upon the Bank would usually be much more convenient and useful.

The unrestricted issue of notes and tokens would not affect interest in the slightest degree. Prompt paper alone can be at par. It can only displace coin in the currency. Delayed notes must always be at a discount. These do not displace coin, except when made legal tender, and then their depreciation is in proportion to the excess in which they are put into circulation.

J. Greevz Fisher.

October 26, 1896.

In Reply to the Foregoing.

(1) From which it follows that the dearness of the monetary accommodation of the world can be reduced by extending the accommodation. The price now paid, in interest, cannot be lowered to the competitive limit while money is maintained upon the restricted basis of gold, diluted, as it is, with only roundabout and privileged extensions.

(2) I thought *gold* was the only medium. Ah! I see—gold is the only money, and money is not a medium?

(3) I am still wondering.

(4) Whether "fractional coins, tokens, and promises" are money or not makes not the least difference. Any other name will smell as sweet. But it is the expansion and usefulness of *these things* you name that I want enhanced; and it is these things only that I will discuss under the name "money."

(5) From which it follows that the world's accumulated wealth can be valued in terms of gold only by its "habitual, constant, and invariable convertibility" into gold; a position from which the only escape is the invention of money that will facilitate the exchange of any kind of wealth for any other kind of wealth with the least possible call for gold or no call at all, as do to some extent the check, bank note, and token systems. The old English tradesmen's tokens were worded in terms of the silver penny,—the then standard unit,—and, in the spheres of their influence, they were (as far as I know) at par with silver, because of the "popular belief that no interruption or delay in convertibility" of them into bread and treacle and candles, etc., "need be taken into account."

(6) But "checks and other forms of money notes" *do* increase the volume of transactions (in quantity and number) without a corresponding increase in the volume of gold.

(7) Which he doesn't.

(8) It is safest to assume nothing.

(9) No proof at all. Abundance has to go hand in hand with easy terms to be any relief. Checks do *not* meet the want of a currency, as already shown by me. As for the Bank of England, *its total* reserve to its liabilities (lumping check and note systems) is to-day (November 13) 52⅝ per cent., with a discount rate of 4 per cent., and a timidity against this reserve being lowered which would send up the Bank rate if any heavy withdrawals for use took place.

(10) SUGGESTION FOR A BILL.

£1. ONE POUND NOTE £1.
on The ______ Free Trade Bank, Limited,
THREADNEEDLE STREET, LONDON,
OPPOSITE THE BANK OF ENGLAND.

This Certificate is issued against collateral of not less value than One Pound Sterling deposited with us, which collateral, or other equivalent collateral, or the equivalent gold face value of this note, will be held by us while this note is outstanding.

Dated this first day of ______ 19__
For The ______ Free Trade Bank, Limited.

No. 6985.
Adam Psametticus Smith, Chief Cashier.
Lucy Aurelia Duckylorum, - Accountant.
Prudencio Hidalgo, - - - - Appraiser.

NEGOTIABLE WITHOUT ENDORSEMENT.

SUGGESTION FOR A TOKEN.

JOHN BADCOCKE
HIS HALFF PENY

(11) Mr. Fisher might just as well predict that, while cash sales of ordinary commodities are at a discount, forward sales will always be at a higher figure. There's no rule in the matter. It all depends upon demands and supplies, or the ability of syndicates and privileged people to *corner* markets. Where there's a demand for forward delivery in excess of prompt delivery (*caet. par.*), the price for the former will be the higher—and *vice versa*.

(12) Read again my essay, and cogitate upon the functions of a banker for another twenty years, and maybe you'll understand.

(13) What a fib!

John Badcock, Jr.

Leyton, England, November 13, 1896.

Anarchist Letter-Writing Corps.

The Secretary wants every reader of Liberty to send in his name for enrolment. Those who do so thereby pledge themselves to write, when possible, a letter every fortnight, on Anarchism or kindred subjects, to the "target" assigned in Liberty for that fortnight, and to notify the secretary promptly in case of any failure to write to a target (which it is hoped will not often occur), or in case of temporary or permanent withdrawal from the work of the Corps. All, whether members or not, are asked to lose no opportunity of informing the secretary of suitable targets. Address, Stephen T. Byington, Belvidere, N. J.

☞ For the present the fortnightly supply of targets will be maintained by sending members a special monthly circular, alternating with the issue of Liberty.

Target, both sections.—The "Investigator", 9 Appleton Street, Boston, on December 19 printed the following in a long editorial entitled "The Injustice of Prohibition":

If Mr. Spencer is correct in the opinion above quoted (and that he is so we think will be readily admitted by every intelligent person), the principal, if not the only, business of civil government is the enforcement of the law of equal freedom and the administration of justice between man and man. This law is formulated by the same author in the same work, on page 121, as follows:

"Every man has freedom to do all that he wills, provided he infringes not the equal freedom of any other man."

According to this theory, the State is not instituted for the purpose of restricting the liberty of any citizen, except in so far as that is absolutely necessary to preserve the like liberty of every other citizen. In other words, instead of depriving people of their natural rights and liberties, its imperative duty is to insure to all of them the full and complete enjoyment thereof; and, whenever it does more than this in regard to their personal conduct, it reverses its function, and itself becomes an aggressor. It is wholly immaterial to any person whether he is deprived of his natural rights and liberties by some other person, or whether the same act is performed by the State, the result being the same in both cases. From this fundamental principle it follows that whatever is wrong for an individual to do to another is equally wrong for the government to do to that other or to anyone else. Consequently, the only control which it can properly exercise over the conduct of any one of its citizens is to prevent him from injuring, or from encroaching upon the rights of, his neighbor. From these general principles it follows inevitably that it can have no legitimate control over the morals of any of its citizens, so long as they do not violate the law of equal freedom to which we have already referred, and that, therefore, it ought to confine its efforts simply to the punishment of crime, and not to the punishment of mere vice,—the distinction between the two being that the latter is an injury to oneself, and the former is an injury to another. It is no more immoral or criminal to sell liquor than it is to sell gunpowder, dynamite, nitro-glycerine, poison, or firearms, all of which have their legitimate and proper uses, and may also be employed in the commission of crime. The mere buying and selling of these or of any other merchandise is not criminal conduct on the part of either party to that transaction, as the rights of third parties are in no wise restricted thereby; and the vendor cannot be justly held responsible for any crime which the vendee may commit by means of them, unless he sells them with the knowledge that they are to be used for that purpose; and even in that case he is amenable to punishment only as *particeps criminis* in the crime itself, and not as a dealer in those commodities, as the mere selling of them is not criminal according to the true meaning of that word.

Point out how these principles involve the condemnation of those laws on which the whole fabric of our government rests.

Stephen T. Byington.

A Convert.

To pretty Anna I proposed
Last night when we were at the tryst;
To government she'd been opposed,
But she is now an Anna kissed.

Walter Bryant.

Elusive Joys.

Beauty hideth,
Nature chideth,
When the heart is cold.
Fame is galling,
Gold's enthralling,
When the mind is sold.

Basil Dahl.

The State and Education.

Since the time that we have had organized government in this country, our schools have been operated and controlled by State agencies. These conditions have so long obtained that it has become fashionable to speak of our public schools as the great bulwark of American institutions, and most people look upon our public school system as the palladium of republican ideas. Therefore any criticism directed against our schools is heard with small patience, and serious opposition to the system always excites among those who hear it something akin to "conniption fits."

Nevertheless there have been in the past numerous instances where popular opinion was as firmly fixed, and seemingly as securely entrenched, in a position subsequently proven erroneous, and from which it was easily dislodged, as it is now in the matter of public schools.

The principal reason for the strong hold that our public school system has upon the public is the fact of a popular misconception as to its character. We call it a free school system. It is the word free, and the apparent free intermingling of the children at school, that give the system its popular strength.

If it was denominated as its real character demands, and called what it is,—a compulsory school system,—it would not appeal so strongly to unthinking, but real, liberty lovers.

Our public school system is wrong because its establishment and maintenance are an invasion of individual freedom. It takes away from parents the free exercise of rightful control over their children by obliging them to make use of school facilities which they do not approve, and to which they are opposed.

Parents are responsible for the existence of their children, and nothing should be done by the State that interferes with, or impairs, that natural responsibility. Therefore every parent should be left free to use such educational agencies and methods as are by him deemed fittest for the education of his children. No one should be encouraged in the belief, or practice, of the idea that, however many children he may bring into the world, society is bound to see to it that they shall be provided, at public cost, with an education. Personal independence should not be weakened by the cultivation of any such idea; every man should feel that the position of himself and family in society, and the education fitting them for proper occupancy of that position, are due solely to his own efforts, limited only by the natural interdependence incident to our social organization.

Love of offspring is the strongest affection with which we are endowed, and, if left free, its natural promptings will be sufficient incentive to impel the provision of better educational facilities than are possible in any other way. For instance, a child shows that it possesses faculties indicating a fitness for certain vocations; now these faculties need only cultivation to insure proficiency in certain special ways. The public school affords no opportunity for special training, and the enforced contributions exacted from parents in support of the public school so weaken the family resources that they are unable to expend their money in the direction that gives the best promise.

The very nature of the system limits opportunity in the public school to the established curriculum. With schools such as would naturally spring into existence everywhere in response to what was demanded, there would be opportunity to buy the kind of mental cultivation and training that was wanted; nor would time and money be wasted in the acquisition of knowledge not deemed needful by the recipients and those most interested in them. With free voluntary coöperation there would be great diversity in the kind and character of schools, and the competition and emulation incident to such a state of things would be conducive to a more rapid growth and a higher efficiency than are possible with the uniform conditions prevailing in our public schools.

No man should be deprived of that which he wants and to which he is justly entitled, by being obliged to expend his energy for things that he does not want or the use of which he cannot approve. There are millions of parents in this country obliged to contribute in the shape of taxes to the support of public schools, who are thereby deprived of the pleasure incident to the exercise of the natural right of affording their children the kind of instruction that they deem most beneficial. Those of them who are able to send their children to other schools are unjustly made to pay their money in support of the public school, receiving therefrom absolutely no return whatever. The exercise of any power on the part of the State that is, in its operation, unjust to its citizens is not only indefensible, but should be utterly condemned.

All parents as individuals have an inalienable right to educate their children in accordance with the wishes and desires of the children and themselves, guided and inspired by indications of innate talent, limited only by the exercise of equal freedom on the part of every other parent and child. And, while society may have the power to limit and abridge that right, the exercise of such power cannot justly be defended. Every exaction imposed by society should be founded upon the idea that every member of society is entitled to equal freedom; no other rule can be defended, nor is any other rule justly entitled to observance.

Why should anybody be taxed, in order that somebody else may have and enjoy benefits at less than cost? How can there be any justification of the taxation of any individual in support of a system in the creation of which they had no choice or which they do not use.

The tendency of civilization is in the direction of homogeneity as pertaining to aggregations of individuals, and in that of a greater heterogeneity as pertaining to individuals themselves. Therefore the public school is entirely inadequate to, and wholly unfitted for, the proper education of those who are to become the citizens of the future. The public school can impart only one kind of education; all must be treated alike, as it would be manifestly improper to give any scholar a higher or more expensive form of education than others receive.

No partiality can be shown in a public-school system; yet, because of the diversity of future vocation, and therefore diversity of want, the requirements of society demand different educational treatment, and different school facilities, for different individuals.

If the State has the right to establish schools in which our children are to be educated, it has also the right to compel attendance at those schools. More than that, the State has a right to say when they shall go, how long they shall stay, and what they shall study. The right of the State in this respect once acknowledged, all individual right to the exercise of educational liberty is forever surrendered. The State never gives up power once exercised, except at the end of successful revolution. Is it possible by coercion to change the nature of an unwilling and unreceptive mind, so that it will receive and perceive? You can compel them to come to the educational font, but an unwilling recipient can hardly be obliged to partake. The idea of the usefulness of the mental discipline received in a stuffing process is greatly over estimated. The only discipline that is worth anything is such as is acquired by experience in ways that enable the recipient to distinguish the useful from the useless: the mere memorizing and mechanical recitation of rules lacks the essential qualities of experience. Most children can attend school but a short time; the circumstances of their station in life are such that but a limited amount of education is necessary; because of the attempt on the part of the State to furnish everybody with more education than is wanted there has been a failure to furnish enough of the kind that is wanted. Supply will not create desire, but desire that is not satisfied by a supply will soon wither and die. Every scholar should receive the kind of education that he himself wants, subject to no influence other than parental. Any child that has an unquenchable desire for knowledge,—and without desire attainment is impossible—will be impelled to sufficient effort, and will incite the parental aid necessary, to enable him to satisfy that desire.

The arbitrary imposition of a fixed kind of education upon anybody by State agencies should not for a moment be permitted. A system of that kind is entirely out of harmony with the spirit of republican institutions. Institutions out of harmony with individual liberty tend to weaken and destroy those individual characteristics which are essential to the growth and development of a free people.

"Oh! but the poor,—what is to be done for them? They ought to be educated. How is it to be done? They cannot educate themselves. Surely, organized society ought to interfere here, and provide means to enable these people to lift themselves out of their present unfortunate condition."

Well, grant that that is true; how far do you propose going in that direction, and where do you propose to stop? If it is the duty of the State to provide education, it is the duty of the State to furnish the means of getting an education. Of what use are school houses and school teachers without school-books; those being provided, how can children go to school with empty stomachs and without clothes? How far are you willing to go in this direction? Where shall the line be drawn at which you will stop extending the State aid? There is no stopping place, and can be none, once you justify the idea that it is proper for the State to afford education to the poor.

Acceptance of, and action in accordance with, the idea that it is the duty of the State to furnish education to the poor, instead of being an aid to them, will have ultimately an opposite effect. It will encourage improvident marriages, thereby increasing the number to which aid must be extended, and it will lower the conception of parental obligation and duty.

Think of encouraging the preposterous idea that parents need give but little thought to the necessity of educating their offspring!

Think of encouraging citizens in the belief that the education of their own children is of small concern, but that the education of everybody else's children is a matter of prime importance that can in no wise be neglected,—that is, that direct obligations to your own children are secondary to the indirect obligations to children in general!

And so people are to marry when they feel like it, and bring into the world as many children as they may, and society, not they, must assume the burden and accept the consequences! How far is it from this point to the place where the assertion comes in: "Society owes me a living; therefore I must have it." As a matter of justice, why should plenty be taxed in order that want may have? Why should the thrifty and provident be taxed in order that the unthrifty and improvident may live? Is there any justification for the taking from the good-for-somethings and giving to the good-for-nothings, thereby impairing the usefulness of the good-for-somethings and making the good-for-nothings still more good for nothing?

Oh! they say, but something must be done in the name of, and for the sake of, humanity. Well, grant it. Can human sympathy be properly expressed through the operation of arbitrary law?

Society is not a matter of creation, but it has been, and is, a thing of growth; and its best growth and development are attained in an atmosphere of freedom. From the absence of compulsory measures it does not follow that no provision will be made for those who are worthy, but unfortunate.

Voluntary actions incited by the sympathy incident to the natural love of man for his fellows will and must be more effective than any coercive effort on the part of the State. Even if not, would the indiscriminate helping of everybody who is poor be a proper exercise of the best humanity?

Let us see. What we all desire is a society composed of strong, self reliant, self-supporting members; now, will that be soonest attained by obliging the self-supporting to carry the non supporting, in order that the latter may live and propagate their kind. Or will it not rather come soonest by leaving unthrift and improvidence to suffer from the consequences of their imperfections, in order that the race may the more quickly reach conditions of perfection. The best humanity is action along the line that will achieve the largest and best ultimate outcome.

Conditions of perfection cannot be brought about by governmental regulations, because people must learn to perceive what is good for them because it is good for them; and they can do this only by being al-

lowed opportunity for the free exercise of individual faculty. Experience is the only school, and experience is a thing that, in the very nature of things, must be acquired by personal action; it can in nowise be taught by rule or learned by rote. Do what you will and as much as you may, the pains and penalties incident to the thorough adaptation of man to conditions necessary to life must be gone through with; so the highest and best humanity consists in asserting and insisting that every individual must be self-supporting and non-aggressive. Every action out of harmony with that idea only defers and makes more difficult the object to be attained; so, by helping incompetence at the expense of competence, in order that you may have the proximate seeming benefits, you are not only unjustly burdening the worthy, but you are defeating the very object sought.

Did it ever occur to any who favor aid to improvidence at the expense of providence that they propose exactly the thing that was the cause of the improvident's present condition,—that is, sacrificing the ultimate good in order that present gratification may be enjoyed?

The best humanity does not consist in increasing the evil sought to be cured. Then there are those who say that "the interest and judgment of the people most interested are not sufficient guarantee of the goodness of the commodity." That is to say, they do not know what they want; therefore it is, and of right should be, given to those of us possessing long heads and high foreheads to prescribe what is to be taken, and oblige the recipients to partake. Now, inasmuch as personal experience is a prime essential to the growth and development of a discriminating intelligence, how long do you think it will be necessary for the self esteemed few to act as mentors for the ignorant many before the latter become sufficiently intelligent to act and judge for themselves? Furthermore, supposing that these people should take it into their empty heads that they not only know what they want for themselves, but that you do not know what you ought to have for yourselves, and should institute schools to their own liking and oblige you to support them and partake thereof,—what would you think of the wisdom or justice of their action? Again: did it ever occur to those of you who believe in the teleological origin and disposition of things that there are millions of people who regard religion as of more importance than all other things put together? Suppose it was insisted that everybody should be obliged to partake of religious instruction and training in our schools,—would not the end justify whatever means might be adopted in enforcement thereof? Is not something which concerns us for all time of more importance than anything that relates only to our limited stay upon earth? It is no answer to say that religious liberty must not be interfered with, for religious thought cannot justly be accorded exclusive privileges as to freedom. If it is right that men should have and enjoy religious freedom, it is right that they should have and enjoy educational freedom. If the best interests of society demand that men be left free to worship or not worship God, according to the dictates of their own consciences, the best interests of society also demand that men be left free to educate or not educate themselves according to the demands of their own innate desires. Still another thing: love of country and proper respect for its laws are not best subserved or conserved by arbitrarily obliging people who believe religious instruction necessary to support schools in which such instruction is not imparted.

Now, let us look in another direction. Man was not, nor is he, created, but, like everything else on earth, is a thing of growth; smoothing away the rough places and making things easy for him are not conducive to his best growth and highest development. He must learn by experience what is best for his growth and advancement; there is no other way of finding out. Physical nutrition is required, and mental nutrition is required; it is impossible to partake of the latter until the stomach is full; you cannot fill the head before you fill the belly. Now, if it is incumbent on the State to furnish mental nutrition, is it not a greater and more urgent duty that bodily nutriment shall be first supplied?

Without going further, it may well be asked how can the State supply a want that the people composing the State cannot supply? Whatever may be done must be done by the expenditure of energy. The State is without force, except as it gathers it from the people through the tax-gatherer; and, however much the State may gather, the force will always be subject to the loss incident to the collection and distribution thereof. The amount of force to be had can in nowise be increased; and for that reason, whenever government attempts to do too many things, or too much of anything, it fails to properly do the things that it is proper that government should do. We all desire as little government as possible; we may differ as to what is necessary, but we all desire—yes, more, we demand—that that government shall be good. Government in this country is the expression of the will of the majority, and whether it is good or bad depends upon the character of the units of which it is composed. Now let us note the probable influence of our public schools in individual character-making with relation to future citizens.

Strong, self-reliant, self supporting citizens are essential to the best growth and highest development of society. The influence of the public school upon the early life of the individual at a time when character is being formed is inimical to the growth and development of the right kind of citizens. As children they have been supplied with an education by the State; their natural guardians and protectors have been lost sight of as factors in their education; therefore they do not feel, when they arrive at man's estate, and themselves become parents, that it is incumbent on them to educate the children that have come to them. The State has assumed that duty; they were educated in schools furnished by the State, and their children will be so educated; and so they learn to look to and lean upon the State, which soon comes to be regarded as an entity possessing resources that can, and should, be applied to the alleviation of hardships, the removal of obstacles, and, finally, the providing of the means of satisfying ordinary human needs. People learn to expect things from the State that are impossible of attainment from that source,—things that can be had only as the result of exercise of individual faculty and effort,—a fact which they have been taught to ignore. They look to, and expect from, the State the supply; at first they are disappointed only; then come feelings of dissatisfaction, then murmurs of discontent, then popular manifestations more or less lawless, such as found expression in the demonstration witnessed in 1894, which came to be known as Coxeyism. That affair was a logical sequence of the past exercise of paternal functions on the part of governmental agencies, and therefore an effect of the cultivation and growth of the idea not only that an exercise of functions of this kind is a governmental duty, but that the people have a right to expect, and demand, aid from the government whenever it to them seems necessary. Anything that aids the cultivation and growth of sentiment of this kind is wrong, and, if persisted in, can end in only one way,—that is, in the destruction and extinction of republican institutions.

You cannot have a democratic republic without republicans. Republicans are always independent and self-reliant. Citizens of this character cannot be created; they must grow; and they can grow and develop only in an atmosphere of freedom. Artificial aid in the shape of compulsory schools, instead of being in harmony with what ought to be, and therefore useful, is not only unnecessary and useless, but actually repressive and harmful.

Here are young minds to be trained; how, and with what, shall they be trained? Is there a teacher in the world that can tell? Is there an aggregation of teachers in the world, or can an aggregation of teachers be gotten together, that can tell what kind of training is wanted, and how best to supply it? A very wide diversity as to kind and quality is required; here are all kinds of faculty, and all degrees of the same kind of faculty, to be cultivated and trained; these faculties are in the possession of individuals no two of whom are alike; and it is expected that this vast heterogeneous number of youthful individuals can be best developed mentally by sending them to schools of uniform character, where the curriculum is fixed, and can be changed only by act of some legislative body. If a man had a horse to be broken, or a dog to be trained, he would hesitate long enough to look around before he sent it to a training-school of the kind we have adopted for the education of our children. Compulsory support of the public schools ought to be no longer insisted upon. Oh! but they say, that would amount to the abolishment of the system. Well, if compulsory support is what sustains the system, it certainly ought to be abolished; anything that cannot stand by force of merit upon its own feet is unworthy of a place in a free country, and the sooner it is done away with the better. Abolish schools! No, simply withdraw compulsory support. Open-mouthed astonishment immediately exclaims: "But what would you put in the place?" And, when the reply is, as it must be, "nothing," they turn with a look of contemptuous disgust, as much as to say that it is not worth while to continue the discussion. But wait one moment; is it reasonable to expect that a want, though it may be known and universal,—a want that is not the same in any two individuals, and that by right is entitled to a supply as varied as is the want,—can be anticipated and supplied by a fixed plan. In the abandonment of the public-school system the only thing necessary is to stop right where you are; as soon as desire is left free to act, the ever-responsive faculties that enable us to supply all of our wants will assert themselves, and soon find and develop the best way.

Desire and exertion, not machinery and supply, create appetite. Without purpose on the part of the recipient education is impossible; there must be a will before there can be a way; gratuitous bestowal will avail nothing, and coercion is recognition of unacknowledged defeat. Education, to be appreciated, must not be made cheap and easy of attainment; it is the things striven for and won by force of merit that are esteemed and that become profitable.

The giving away of prized things destroys the incentive for their acquisition. Under such conditions there can be no conquest of opposing obstacles, at the end of which the conqueror may proudly turn to his fellows and enjoy the sweet feelings of satisfaction aroused by admiring approval.

Change is the natural order of things; everything by which we are surrounded and with which we have to do is ceaselessly changing.

Society has ever been, and is now, the result of countless imperceptible changes that have been going on for all time. Nothing is to day as it was yesterday; nothing will be to morrow as it is to-day; and so it is that human life is simply a matter of adaptation and readaptation to the constantly changing conditions by which we are surrounded and with which we are confronted. A proper school system must be something that is in harmony with evolutionary law, and such a system is possible only when the people are left free to supply by voluntary coöperation whatever they themselves may feel that they need. Schools that fail to meet requirements will pass away, and their places will be taken by schools that meet and satisfy the demand. These orderly, because natural, changes will take place just as easily as the stage-lines and stage-coaches of a generation ago were superseded by the railroad. And just as the primitive railroad with its puny equipment has grown and developed into the great trunk lines of to day, equipped with giant locomotives, immense freight trains, and sumptuous passenger-coaches, so will schools, under conditions of freedom, come into existence, and, in harmony with an always preexisting demand, grow and develop into the highest possible usefulness.

Inasmuch as we cannot under any circumstances create, we should allow the problem to solve itself, as it surely and rightly will, by natural means in natural ways.

The teacher, instead of being circumscribed by the hampering limitations of a rigid system fixed by arbitrary law, would be free to act in an original way, always in harmony with the demand expressed by those entrusted to his care, and, instead of being, as now, a mere part of a huge machine, would, because of freedom of opportunity, become a real, living, forceful member of a noble profession with a power for good that under present conditions is impossible; for, instead of being constantly confined within the limits of prescribed rules, he would be free to adopt hopeful suggestions that must, in the very nature of things, come to him from time to time. He would grow and develop therefore into an enlarged sphere of usefulness, and would be able ultimately to command a recognition fitting this noblest of human vocations.

A. W. Wright.

My Confession.

The song my heart would sing
Is like the murmuring
Of peaceful streams when soft they glide away
To far-off seas that call them, journeying;
But sometimes may it ring
Like waters when they fling,
O'er sands and shoals and rocks that stem and stay,
A song of battle and of triumphing.

The life that I would know
Is that which free could go,—
The calm, untroubled life that finds its ends,
And moves through all its ways nor fast nor slow;
But sometimes it must grow
Tumultuous; I must throw
Myself on that which hampers me and bends,
And see it crash in ruin and lie low.

William Francis Barnard.
